

and a stand-by state by rendering the printer to a sleep mode (Abstract). The Office Action asserts that Miyazaki teaches many of the features recited in at least independent claim 16. The Office Action concedes that Miyazaki fails to teach that the processor is in an off-state in the power save mode. Rather, the Office Action relies on Omizo, in its disclosure of a computer system capable of controlling the power supplied to specific modules, to make up for this shortfall.

Omizo is directed to a computer system having a processor that when all the devices connected to a specific IO bus have been out of use for a long time, the processor transmits a control signal to stop the supply of power to the IO bus to the power sequence controller (Abstract). Omizo teaches, at col. 5, lines 55-61 and col. 6, lines 9-10, that even when the supply of power to the IO bus 3a is stopped, the power is allowed to remain supplied to the signal line used to receive an interrupt notice from a device 31 connected to the IO bus 3a. When the device generates an interrupt, the interrupt notice is transmitted to an interrupt controller 35. The interrupt controller 35 informs the processor 10 of the notice. When the processor 10 is in an off state, the power sequence controller 33 turns on the processor 10 at the time when it receives the notice, thereby causing the processor 10 to receive the notice from the interrupt controller 35. In the processor 10 that has received the interrupt notice, the operating system 40 executed on the processor 10 starts the power supply control driver 41.

The Office Action asserts that this recitation in Omizo corresponds to the claimed processor being in an off-state in the power save mode and being in an on-state in the normal mode to control the image forming portion. The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have combined the processor functionality in Omizo with the apparatus of Miyazaki because it allows for the device to consume less energy whenever it is in an off-state rather than always being on and consuming power.

The Office Action concedes that the combination of Miyazaki and Omizo fails to teach a communication interface that controls a speed for receiving data during the period of transition. Rather, the Office Action relies on Itoh, in its disclosure of a multi-function device and information storing medium, to make up for this shortfall.

Itoh is directed to a multi-function device connected to a computer that includes a printer for printing on a recording paper, a modem for making facsimile communications, and an interface for receiving printing data from the computer, a memory commonly used for the printer and the modem, and a controller for controlling the printer and the modem (Abstract). The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have combined the controlling of the speed for receiving data, such as that taught in Itoh, with Miyazaki because it prevents the printer from receiving more data than the printer is able to store and therefore would not overload the memory and cause an error as a result. The analysis of the Office Action fails for at least the following reason.

Itoh, teaches, in Fig. 2, an MFD 2 that has an interface 36 having a buffer 36a and a CPU 31. Itoh, teaches, at col. 6, lines 9-15, that the reception speed control means 31b of the CPU 31 functions to slow down the speed at which the RAM 33 receives the printing data from a personal computer 1 if the capacity remaining in the RAM 33 reduces to below a predetermined level while the MFD 2 operates in the facsimile transmission or reception mode. In view of this recitation in Itoh, the Office Action's conclusion regarding what the reference suggests are unreasonable because (1) it is the CPU 31 that controls the reception speed and not the interface 36 as the Office Action asserts and (2) the reception speed in Itoh is reduced during normal operation in the facsimile transmission or reception modes, and not during a period of transition, as recited in claim 16.

For at least the foregoing reasons, no combination of Itoh, Omizo and Miyazaki would have rendered obvious the combination of all the features recited in independent claim 16.

Further, and because Kawase cannot reasonably be considered to make up for the above-identified shortfalls in the other applied references, no combination of the currently-applied references would have rendered obvious the combinations of all the features recited in dependent claims 17-25 for at least the dependence of these claims on independent claim 16, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 16-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the various combinations of currently-applied references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 16-25 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Michael J. Steger
Registration No. 66,034

JAO:MJS/mef

Date: March 8, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
